Remarks

The claims in the application are 1-20 and Claims 21-26 added by the present amendment.

Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

A new title has been inserted in accordance with paragraph 1 of the Office Action. Concerning paragraph 2 of the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that line 18 on page 4 of the specification is grammatically correct because "are" refers to "stretching" and "oxidizing". A copy of Form PTO-1449 accompanying the Information Disclosure Statement timely filed on April 24, 1998, in enclosed. It is respectfully requested that the art listed upon this timely-filed Information Disclosure Statement be made of record in the above-identified application.

Claims 21-26 introduced herewith find clear support throughout the present application. For example, Claims 21 and 22 find support, e.g., at the top of page 1 and the bottom of pages 3 and 4 of the specification, with Claims 23 and 24 finding explicit support at the bottom of page 4 of the specification. Additionally, Claims 25 and 26 find support, e.g., in the specific examples as presented in Tables 1 and 2. Accordingly, the only outstanding issue is the art rejection of the claims.

More particularly, all Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 4,318,950 to Takashi et al. in view of European Pat. No. 0 613 919 to Ueda et al.(corresponding to U.S. Pat. No.5,652,326). However, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention is not at all taught or suggested by the combination of applied references, for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to an inventive synthetic paper which possesses not only excellent printability in offset printing or flexography but also excellent antistatic properties as well. Attaining these two properties has often been mutually exclusive. For example, Ueda et al., which is described at pages 2-3 in the background portion of the present application, might have improved permanent antistatic properties, but possesses the drawback of being unable to printed by offset printing or flexography. The present invention enables attainment of these two mutually exclusive goals by providing, either as the base material (Claim 1) or surface layers upon the base material (Claim 19), the claimed polypropylene resin composition including fine inorganic particles and a film which is stretched and has a surface which is oxidized. The features of the presently claimed invention together with the accompanying advantages attained thereby, are not taught or suggested by the applied references, for the following reasons.

As noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Takashi et al. fail to teach the claimed polyolefin resin composition capable of imparting antistatic properties. In this regard, Ueda et al. add nothing to the teachings of Takashi et al. which would at all render obvious

the invention claimed herein. More specifically, Ueda et al. do not disclose presence of a composition having antistatic properties in a stretched film, and further do not mention application of the resin composition to offset printing or flexography. As pointed out above, the resin composition disclosed in Ueda et al. actually possesses the drawback of being unable to be printed by offset printing or flexography.

On the other hand, the present invention clearly provides a synthetic paper possessing excellent printability including excellent permanent antistatic properties and offset printability, as documented in the comparative testing outlined in the present application. More specifically, Comparative Examples 1 to 3 document that when a surface layer of a laminated paper composition does not contain the claimed antistatic resin, then ink adhesion property during offset printing is poor although surface resistivity might be good (Comparative Example 1). Alternatively, when the surface layer does not contain inorganic filler, then ink adhesion property at offset printing is poor although surface resistivity might be good (Comparative Example 2). Moreover, when the surface layer is not subjected to stretching, then the surface resistivity, ink adhesion and suitability for paper feeding/discharge are all poor (Comparative Example 3). In contrast, the examples of the presently claimed inventive paper laminate exhibit both excellent permanent antistatic properties and offset printability.

In view of the above, it has clearly been documented that only the compositions having the claimed constitution herein will provide both excellent antistatic properties as well as excellent offset printability.

The remaining art of record has not been applied against the claims and will not be commented upon further at the present time.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Amendment and accompanying remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending herein are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, then it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the earliest convenience to discuss the present application. A Petition for an automatic one month extension of time for response under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) is enclosed in triplicate together with the requisite petition fee plus the fee for the additional claims introduced herein.

Early, favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DILWORTH & BARRESE

Rocco S. Barrese
Reg. No. 25,253
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, NY 11553
(516) 228-8484
RSB/GMK/jkv